



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,296	04/16/2004	Yeon-ho Jin	Q79989	7766
23373 7590 02/22/2010 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037				
EXAMINER GREENE, JOSEPH L				
ART UNIT 2451		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 02/22/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com
PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM
USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/825,296

Applicant(s)

JIN ET AL.

Examiner

JOSEPH GREENE

Art Unit

2451

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2009.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-9 and 14-18 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-9, and 14-18 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 4-9, and 14-18 are currently pending in this application.
2. No claim amendments were submitted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1, 4-9, and 16-18 are rejected as being unpatentable over Gonzales et al. (Pre-Grant Publication No US 2003/0074088 A1) hereinafter Gonzales, in view of Maxson et al. (Pre-Grant Publication No. US 2002/0171762 A1) hereinafter Maxson.**
5. With respect to claim 1, Gonzales disclosed a method of constructing home-state information in a home network (abstract), comprising: a) constructing a home-state set using a plurality of home-state information sources which expresses the home-state information sources and all the combinations of the home-state information sources ([0004], lines 1-6); b) constructing home-state objects which are specific instances of the home-state set ([0004], lines 1-6; [0010], lines 1-11); and c) constructing home-

state properties expressing properties of the home-state objects which specify characteristic parts of home-state information sources ([0004], lines 1-6; [0010], lines 1-11; it is inherent that objects contain properties that allow another to interact with them). Wherein the constructed home-state set, home-state objects, and home-state properties comprise the constructed home-state information (0004, lines 1-6, where it is exactly the home-state information that is used to construct the aforementioned objects and set. I.e. the information of the light levels and etc.)

However, Gonzales did not explicitly state wherein the home-state set comprises common profiles of each of the home-state information sources, each of the common profiles including characteristics common to all of the home-state information sources and a value for each characteristic that is unique to the home-state information source, and wherein operation a) comprises a) constructing unique profiles of home-state information sources, each of the unique profiles including characteristics of a home-state information source that are not common to all of the home-state information sources and a value for each characteristic that is unique to the home-state information source. On the other hand, Maxson did state wherein the home-state set comprises common profiles of each of the home-state information sources (0054, lines 7-9, where the displayed devices in the menu means that the devices have profiles in the system), each of the common profiles including characteristics common to all of the home-state information sources and a value for each characteristic that is unique to the home-state information source (0072, lines 13-17), and wherein operation a) comprises a) constructing unique profiles of home-state information sources, each of the unique

profiles including characteristics of a home-state information source that are not common to all of the home-state information sources and a value for each characteristic that is unique to the home-state information source (0072, lines 13-23, where the IDs are different unique values for each device).

Both the systems of Gonzales and Maxson are directed towards systems for controlling home networked devices and therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gonzales in order to utilize common profiles for information sources, as taught by Maxson, in order to have a properly functioning interface system that maintains representations of various devices.

6. With respect to claim 16, Gonzales disclosed a system for utilizing home-state information, comprising: an information collecting module operable to collect information from various information sources in a network; a home-state generating module operable to process the collected information to generate home-state information; a home-state analyzing module operable to analyze the generated home-state information depending on home-state properties to produce analyzed information ([0004], lines 1-6; [0010], lines 1-11; where in order to provide the system's services, it needs to generate the information that will provide the actual services); a home-state storing module operable to store the information generated by the home-state generating module and information analyzed by the home-state analyzing module in a computer-readable memory ([0010], lines 27-33); one or more applications in a

computer-readable memory operable to control a predetermined home device using the generated home-state information or the analyzed information; and an Application Programming Interface (API) operable to transmit the information generated by the home-state generating module and the information analyzed by the home-state analyzing module to the applications, wherein the home-state storing module stores a set of information sources and the combinations of the information sources ([0010], lines 6-10).

However, Gonzales did not explicitly state wherein the home-state set comprises common profiles of each of the home-state information sources, each of the common profiles including characteristics common to all of the home-state information sources and a value for each characteristic that is unique to the home-state information source, and wherein operation a) comprises a) constructing unique profiles of home-state information sources, each of the unique profiles including characteristics of a home-state information source that are not common to all of the home-state information sources and a value for each characteristic that is unique to the home-state information source. On the other hand, Maxson did state wherein the home-state set comprises common profiles of each of the home-state information sources (0054, lines 7-9, where the displayed devices in the menu means that the devices have profiles in the system), each of the common profiles including characteristics common to all of the home-state information sources and a value for each characteristic that is unique to the home-state information source (0072, lines 13-17), and wherein operation a) comprises a) constructing unique profiles of home-state information sources, each of the unique

profiles including characteristics of a home-state information source that are not common to all of the home-state information sources and a value for each characteristic that is unique to the home-state information source (0072, lines 13-23, where the IDs are different unique values for each device).

Both the systems of Gonzales and Maxson are directed towards systems for controlling home networked devices and therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gonzales in order to utilize common profiles for information sources, as taught by Maxson, in order to have a properly functioning interface system that maintains representations of various devices.

7. As for claim 18, the combination of Gonzales and Maxson taught all of the limitations described in claim 1. In addition, Gonzales taught the home-state information constructing method according to claim 1, wherein the home-state information sources include home devices, a home agent, home users, home services, and home applications (0004, lines 1-16).

8 As for claim 4, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 1. In addition, Gonzales taught constructing external home service profiles ([0037], lines 13-15; [0038], lines 5-7), and Maxson taught wherein operation a1) comprises, constructing home device profiles ([0054], lines 7-9, 17-20, and 28-32).

9. As for claim 5, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 1. In addition, Gonzales taught setting rules for information source objects which form profiles of the home-state information sources and a combination thereof, the rules being applied to a specific home-state object ([0004], lines 1-6).

10. As for claim 6, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 5. In addition, Gonzales taught wherein the rules are personally defined by a home user ([0010], lines 1-6).

11. As for claim 7, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 5. In addition, Gonzales taught wherein the rules are provided from an external home service provider ([0037], lines 13-15; [0038], lines 5-7).

12. As for claim 8, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 1. In addition, Gonzales taught the home-state set ([0004], lines 1-6), the home-state objects ([0004], lines 1-6; [0010], lines 1-11) and the home-state properties ([0004], lines 1-6; [0010], lines 1-11) and Maxson taught combining a user interface with the home-state information (abstract, lines 12-15).

13. As for claim 9, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 8. In addition, Gonzales taught combining an Application Programming Interface (API) with the home-state information to enable the constructed home-state information to

be accessed from an external application ([0010], lines 6-10; the SPI mentioned in the prior art represents the API of the system).

14. As for claim 17, the combination of Gonzales and Maxson taught all of the limitations described in claim 1. In addition, Maxson taught wherein the one or more applications are constructed so that transmission or reception of home-state information there between is performed using Meta data for the information generated by the home-state generating module and the information analyzed by the home-state analyzing module (0054, lines 28-32, where the reception of info is taking place by the user and the different states are metadata).

15. Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gonzales, in view of Maxson, and in further view of Official Notice.

16. With respect to claim 14, the combination of Gonzales and Maxson taught all of the limitations described in claim 1. In addition, Gonzales taught collecting information from home-state information sources on a home network through an information collecting module; processing the collected information to generate home-state information including a home-state set expressing all combinations of the various information sources in the network (0004, lines 1-6, where the explanation of this argument can be found in the response to arguments section with respect to the arguments against claims 1, 16, and 18); analyzing the generated home-state

information to produce an event which specifies the generated home-state information; ([0004], lines 1-6; [0010], lines 1-11, where in order to provide the services, it will need to generate the information that will provide the actual services); and storing the generated home-state information in a computer-readable memory ([0010], lines 27-33) and Maxson taught using a home agent ([0008], lines 8-16; the mentioned PDCU is a device designed to collect and process information from other connected devices). The combination of Gonzales and Maxson, however, does not teach announcing the event outside the home network. However, the examiner takes official notice that announcing an event outside of a home by analyzing the home-state information is well known and expected in the art in a common burglar alarm computer system. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gonzales in order to combine event communicating practices found in many alarm systems in order to provide more features to event based computer system.

17. As for claim 15, it is rejected on the same basis as claim 14. In addition, the examiner takes official notice that announcing an event outside of a home by analyzing the home-state information is well known and expected in the art in a common burglar alarm computer system. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gonzales in order to combine event communicating practices found in many alarm systems in order to provide more features to event based computer system.

Response to Arguments

18. Applicant's arguments filed 10/21/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

19. The applicant argues on page 3 that **"Maxson discloses a DCO for each device, the DCO for each device having a logical device ID. Specifically, "[a]s part of creating the DCOs, the DMS 116 assigns each device a logical device ID." See Maxson, ¶ 73. Thus, Maxson makes clear that every device has a DCO containing a device ID. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Maxson neither teaches nor suggests the claimed unique profile "including *characteristics of a home-state information source that are not common to all of the home-state information sources.*" This is because the device ID is not a characteristic, which is "*not common*" to all devices. Rather, as clearly shown above, the device ID is a characteristic common to all devices."**

However, each device ID is unique to each device, as stated in the paragraph above. It may be common that each device has a device ID, but each device ID is unique. Thus, the device identifications are not common to all the devices.

Conclusion

20. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOSEPH GREENE whose telephone number is (571)270-3730. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu, 8:00AM - 4:00Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 5712723964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JLG

/John Follansbee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2451